

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
AT CHATTANOOGA

STATE FARM MUTUAL AUTOMOBILE)
INSURANCE COMPANY,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.) No.: 1:21-CV-91-KAC-SKL
)
 JONATHAN CECIL, JEREMY KENNEDY,)
 and KOLLIN KENNEDY,)
)
 Defendants.)

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER STAYING ACTION

This matter is before the Court on the Parties “Joint Motion to Continue Trial and Suspend Scheduling Order Deadlines” [Doc. 31]. The Parties move the Court to “continue the trial date and suspend the Scheduling Order deadlines until such time after the Court issues a ruling on [Plaintiff]’s Amended Motion for Summary Judgment” [Doc. 31-1 at 3]. Plaintiff’s motion [Doc. 24] is under advisement, and the Parties will understandably require reasonable time to consider any ruling from the Court before proceeding further with this action. Given the current posture of this case, the Parties ask the court to continue the trial and suspend the remaining deadlines in the Scheduling Order until after the Court issues its ruling on the dispositive motion [Doc. 31 at 1].

“[T]he power to stay proceedings is incidental to the power inherent in every court to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants.” *Landis v. N. Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936). However, “a court must tread carefully in granting a stay of proceedings, since a party has a right to a determination of its rights and liabilities without undue delay.” *Ohio Env’t Couns. v. U.S. Dist. Ct., S. Dist. of*

Ohio, E. Div., 565 F.2d 393, 396 (6th Cir. 1977). When evaluating whether to stay a case, the court “must weigh competing interests and maintain an even balance.” *Landis*, 299 U.S. at 254-55 (citations omitted).

Here, a stay of this action until the Court adjudicates “Plaintiff’s Amended Motion for Summary Judgment” [Doc 24] is warranted. There is a pressing need for this stay, which will allow the Court to further consider Plaintiff’s substantive motion and efficiently “control the disposition of the causes on its docket.” *Landis*, 299 U.S. at 254. Once the Court adjudicates Plaintiff’s motion, the Parties will be in a position to promptly consider the Court’s ruling and, if necessary, diligently continue the litigation of this matter. This phasing will result in “economy of time and effort” for the Parties, counsel, and the Court. *Landis*, 299 U.S. at 254.

Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** the Parties’ “Joint Motion to Continue Trial and Suspend Scheduling Order Deadlines” [Doc. 31]. For the reasons set forth above, the Court **STAYS this action until such time as the Court adjudicates “Plaintiff’s Amended Motion for Summary Judgment”** [See Doc. 24]. Within **fourteen (14) days** of the Court’s adjudication of Plaintiff’s motion, the Parties shall file a joint status report outlining the status of the case and providing a proposed schedule, if appropriate.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



KATHERINE A. CRYTZER
United States District Judge